

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

SEP 16 2008
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY mem DEPUTY

TO: ☒ U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / ☐ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Sabraw
FROM: R. Mullin Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 9/12/2008
CASE NO.: 07cv2183 DMS (BLM) DOCUMENT FILED BY: Petitioner
CASE TITLE: Cunningham v. Marshall
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Motion: Court Order for Unlawful Detainer (eviction)

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Rule	Discrepancy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
<input type="checkbox"/>	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<input type="checkbox"/>	5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1	Missing table of contents
<input type="checkbox"/>	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
<input type="checkbox"/>	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
<input type="checkbox"/>		Supplemental documents require court order
<input type="checkbox"/>		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		OTHER: - Motion not signed - Motion not served on opposing counsel

Date forwarded: 9/15/2008

ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- ☐ The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
- ☒ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.
- Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? ☒ Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers ☐

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: DANA M. SABRAW

Dated: 09/15/2008
cc: All Parties

By: A.S.

1 of 3

REJECTED

COPY

IMMATE COPY

1 JAMES H CUNNINGHAM
2 AVENAL STATE PRISON
3 P.O. BOX #8 V 72323
4 AVENAL, CA 93204

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN
DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8 JAMES H CUNNINGHAM (petitioner)

9 v

11 Matthew Cate, (Secretary)

MOTION: COURT ORDER FOR UNLAWFUL

DETAINDER (eviction)
SUPERIOR COURT OF CAL.
SAN DIEGO COUNTY

CASE; #UE014216 named PEDCOR
HOMES CORP. vs. CUNNINGHAM

UNDER PENAL CODE #1258
CASE; NO. 307 cv 02183

17 TO THE HONORABLE MAJESTRATE JUDGE B. BROOKS:
INTRODUCTION

18 IN RE: THE UNLAWFUL DETAINER WILL SHOW THAT PROPERTY SEIZED IN PETITIO
19 NERS HOME WAS OBTAINED ILLEGALLY. AND USED AS EVIDENCE BY THE
DISTRICT ATTORNEY DAN LINKS.

20 Petitioner will make the argument that a illegal lockout was perform
21 without notice which trapan on petitioners (due process) and leasee's
22 civil rights. The performance by prosecutions witness Debra Teich
23 Property Manager. see in public Records Act REQUEST GOVT C 6250-6265
24 see Trombetta & Youngblood-Brady discovery, In re penal code 1#1054-1054
25 .8., Wherein designed to effectuate discovery, see in People v Wright-
26 (1990) 52 c 3d 367, 413, 276 CR 731, 761. There is no provision that only
27 written or recorded statments are subject to discovery, as there is
28 for Manager Teich, lockout procedure which over is shallow. Petitioner